

REMARKS

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1 and 9 have been amended. Claims 1, 3, 4, 7-9, 11, 12, 15 and 16 are pending and under consideration.

ADVISORY ACTION

In the Advisory Action mailed March 16, 2010, the Examiner noted that all pending claims still stand rejected. Claims 1, 3, 7, 9, 11 and 15 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Rosmalen et al. (US 6,130,418) (hereinafter "Van Rosmalen") in view of Nagasato et al. (US 6,181,670) (hereinafter "Nagasato"). Claims 4, 8, 12 and 16 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Rosmalen in view of Nagasato and further in view of Choi (US 2003/0198148) (hereinafter "Choi").

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner also noted that he understands the differences between the present invention and the prior art, but that the claims do not recite the features argued in the response filed February 22, 2010.

Independent claims 1 and 9 have been amended to clarify the relationship of the coils and magnet with respect to the lens.

In their present form, claims 1 and 9 recite that the focusing coil member, the tracking coil member and the single magnet member are installed on one side of the objective lens in an asymmetrical relationship with respect to the lens, and that the blade on which the single magnet member is installed is not in direct communication with the focusing coil and the tracking coil installed on the base to avoid having the blade receive heat generated from current applied to the coil members.

As previously argued, Van Rosmalen discusses an asymmetrical optical pickup actuator in which a focus coil 39, tracking coils 41 and a main lens 15 are carried by a movable part 35 of the optical pickup actuator and a single permanent magnet 45 is carried by a stationary part 33 of the optical pickup actuator. However, Van Rosmalen does not suggest that the focus coil 39 and the tracking coils 41 are installed on a base, while the magnet 45 is installed on a blade (or the holder). Further, this deficiency is cured by Nagasato because Nagasato discusses a symmetrical optical pickup actuator in which the coils 112, 114 are disposed on base block 8, and the magnets 5a-d, 116 and 118 are disposed on a lens holder.

Due to the non-asymmetrical relationship of the magnets 116, 118 in relation to the coils 112, 114, Nagasato and Van Rosmalen do not function to combine in a manner that would have been suggested to one of ordinary skill in the art. Combining Van Rosmalen and Nagasato do not suggest an asymmetrical arrangement of the focusing and tracking coils and the magnet in relation to the lens. Further, claims 1 and 9 have been amended to clarify that the blade on which the single magnet member is installed is not in direct communication with the focusing coil and the tracking coil installed on the base to avoid having the blade receive heat generated from current applied to the coil members.

Claims 3, 4, 7 and 8 depend on claim 1 and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the foregoing reason.

Claims 11, 12, 15 and 16 depend on claim 9 and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the foregoing reason.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejections is requested.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: March 23, 2010

By: Gregory W. Harper
Gregory W. Harper
Registration No. 55,248

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501